

REMARKS

Claims 5-8, 19-22, 34, and 42 are now pending in the application. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection(s) in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 5-8, 34 and 42 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Siniaguine (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0084513 A1). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 5 recites that the insulating layer is formed over an entire surface of the second surface of the substrate. This is shown, for example, in Figure 4 where the insulating layer (generally represented by numerals 38 and 50) is formed over an entire surface of the second surface of the substrate. The Examiner alleges that Siniaguine teaches an insulating layer that is formed over an entire surface of the second surface.

Upon review of Siniaguine, however, no such teaching could be located. At best, Siniaguine merely teaches an insulating layer 140 that terminates on a surface of the protruding electrode 160. The alleged insulating layer 140, however, is not disposed over any portion of the second surface of the substrate 110, as claimed. Because the alleged insulting layer of Siniaguine does not cover an entire surface of the second surface, as claimed, Applicant respectfully asserts that Claim 5 and each corresponding dependent claim would not have been obvious in view of Siniaguine.

Claims 19-22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Siniaguine (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0084513 A1) in view of

Patti (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0048459 A1). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As stated above, Siniaguine fails to teach an insulating layer formed over an entire surface of the claimed second surface. Claim 19 also recites such a limitation. Accordingly, since Siniaguine is silent with respect to this aspect of the claimed invention, it would not have been obvious to combine the teachings of Siniaguine with the teachings of Patti to arrive at the claimed invention defined in claims 19-22.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: Sept 22, 2006

By: G. Gregory Schivley, Reg. No. 27,382
Bryant E. Wade, Reg. No. 40,344

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

GGG/BEW/JAH